

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

**CALVIN DEWAYNE WARREN, #789034, §
Petitioner, §**

v. §

3:10-CV-0737-P

**RICK THALER, Director,
Texas Department of Criminal Justice,
Correctional Institutions Div.,
Respondent.** §

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), and an order of the District Court in implementation thereof, this case has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge. The findings, conclusions and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are as follows:

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Type Case: This is a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus brought by a state prisoner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

Parties: Petitioner is presently incarcerated within the Texas Department of Criminal Justice -- Correctional Institutions Division (TDCJ-CID) at the Byrd Unit in Huntsville, Texas. Respondent is the TDCJ-CID Director. The court has not issued process in this case, pending preliminary screening.

Statement of the Case: In 1997, following his plea of guilty and revocation of his deferred adjudication probation, Petitioner was convicted of aggravated sexual assault and sentenced to seventy-five years imprisonment. *State v. Warren*, F96-77158-R (265th Jud. Dist. Court, Dallas County). He unsuccessfully challenged his conviction in state and federal habeas corpus proceedings, *see Warren v. Director TDCJ*, 3:98-CV-1473 (N.D. Tex. Jun. 6, 2000)

(denying habeas relief), and this court dismissed his last two requests for federal habeas relief as successive. *See Warren v. Johnson*, 3:00-CV1455 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 18, 2000) (dismissed as successive); *Warren v. Director*, 3:98-CV-1473 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 16, 2002) (transferred to the Fifth Circuit because successive), *den. author. to file successive habeas pet.*, No. 02-10460 (5th Cir. May 29, 2002).

In the present action, Petitioner again seeks to challenge his aggravated sexual assault conviction. In six grounds, he alleges he is actually innocent in light of newly discovered evidence, he was denied the effective assistance of counsel and the right to appeal, and his conviction was obtained as a result of an involuntary guilty plea.

Findings and Conclusions: The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 limits the circumstances under which a prisoner may file a second or successive application for post-conviction relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b). A petitioner must show that the successive application is based on: (1) a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, or (2) newly discovered evidence that, if proven and viewed in light of the evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that no reasonable fact finder would have found him guilty of the offense. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2).

Before a petitioner may file his application in the district court, a three-judge panel of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals must determine whether the application makes the requisite *prima facie* showing. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A) and (B). In *United States v. Key*, 205 F.3d 773, 774 (5th Cir. 2000), the Fifth Circuit held that § 2244(b)(3)(A) constitutes a bar to a district court's jurisdiction to consider a successive habeas petition unless the Fifth Circuit has granted

the petitioner permission to file such a petition. *See also Crone v. Cockrell*, 324 F.3d 833, 836 (5th Cir. 2003).

The Fifth Circuit has not issued an order authorizing this court to consider the successive petition in this case. Petitioner must obtain such an order before he can file another petition for habeas relief under § 2254 challenging his underlying criminal conviction. Therefore, this petition should be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Such a dismissal, however, is without prejudice to Petitioner's right to file a motion for leave to file a second or successive § 2254 petition in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit pursuant to § 2244(b)(3)(A). *See In re Epps*, 127 F.3d 364, 365 (5th Cir. 1997) (setting out the requirements for filing a motion for authorization to file a successive habeas petition in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals).

RECOMMENDATION:

For the foregoing reasons it is recommended that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be DISMISSED for want of jurisdiction, but without prejudice to Petitioner's right to file a motion for leave to file a second or successive habeas petition in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A).

Signed this 16th day of April, 2010.


W.M. F. SANDERSON, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

NOTICE

A copy of this report and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this report and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error.